

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on July 11, 2008, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 17, 19, 23, 26, and 29 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 3, line 29-page 4, line 14. Consequently, no new matter has been added.

Claims 1-6, 10-14, 16, 17, 19, and 22-31 remain pending in the application. In the Final Office Action Claims 1-6, 10-14, 16, 17, 19, and 22-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagan et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0056362, hereinafter “Hanagan”) in view of “Cingular Offers Rollover Minutes” (hereinafter “Cingular”).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

Claims 1-6, 10-14, 16, 17, 19, and 22-31 are rejected as being anticipated by Hanagan. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 specifies a method of integrating billing and services management between a wireless telecommunications carrier and a wireline telecommunications carrier. The method includes provisioning a call unit sharing plan allowing a user to charge units of wireless usage and units of wireline usage to one calling plan; receiving wireless usage at a wireless carrier; receiving wireline usage at a wireline usage rating platform; routing the wireless usage to the wireline usage rating platform; receiving a rollover matrix indicating a number of units of call usage that are available for rolling over to a subsequent usage period, wherein the rollover matrix is received by the wireless carrier and a wireline carrier and wherein the rollover matrix allows for publication of the units of wireless usage and the units of wireline usage; rolling over

to the subsequent usage period the number of units of call usage that are available for rolling over; and if any of the wireless or wireline usage requires a billing charge, charging any of the wireless or wireline usage to the call unit sharing plan.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Hanagan and Cingular fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose wherein the rollover matrix is received by the wireless carrier and a wireline carrier and wherein the rollover matrix allows for publication of the units of wireless usage and the units of wireline usage.

In contrast and as stated in the Final Office Action, Hanagan fails to disclose receiving a rollover matrix. See Final Office Action, page 4. Because Hanagan fails to disclose receiving a rollover matrix, Hanagan cannot disclose a rollover matrix received by a wireless and wireline carrier.

Cingular fails to overcome Hanagan's deficiencies. In contrast, Cingular merely discusses that Cingular Wireless became the first major cellular phone company to let customers roll over unused minutes to a following month. See paragraph 6. Cingular does not disclose a rollover matrix being received by a wireline carrier, let a long a rollover matrix for allowing publication of units of wireless and wireline usage.

In particular, Cingular fails to disclose a rollover matrix received by wireless and wireline carriers or a rollover matrix allowing for publication of units of usage. Rather Cingular is silent regarding a rollover matrix and publication of units of usage.

Thus, based on the foregoing, amended claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Hanagan and Cingular and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-6, 10, and

30 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons.

Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Amended independent claims 17 and 29 specify similar features as amended claim 1 and thus are allowable over the combination of Hanagan and Cingular for at least the same reasons. Based on the foregoing, the combination of Hanagan and Cingular fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 17 and 29. Therefore, claims 17 and 29 are allowable and the rejection of these claim should be also withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 19 specifies similar features as amended claim 1 and thus is allowable over the combination of Hanagan and Cingular for at least the same reasons. Based on the foregoing, the combination of Hanagan and Cingular fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 19. Therefore, claim 19 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be also withdrawn. Claims 22 and 31 depend from amended claim 19, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 23 specifies similar features as amended claim 1 and thus is allowable over the combination of Hanagan and Cingular for at least the same reasons. Based on the foregoing, the combination of Hanagan and Cingular fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 23. Therefore, claim 23 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be also withdrawn. Claims 24 and 25 depend from amended claim 23, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 26 specifies similar features as amended claim 1 and thus is allowable over the combination of Hanagan and Cingular for at least the same reasons. Based on

the foregoing, the combination of Hanagan and Cingular fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 26. Therefore, claim 26 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be also withdrawn. Claims 27 and 28 depend from amended claim 26, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Amended claim 11 specifies a method for synchronizing services between a first telecommunications services carrier and a second telecommunications services carrier. The method includes receiving a services order at a first services ordering platform of the first telecommunications services carrier requiring services changes that affect the second telecommunications services carrier; notifying the second telecommunications services carrier to provide the services order to the second telecommunications services carrier; on a periodic basis, updating a customer affiliate subscriber information database in a businesses services platform the services changes that affect the second telecommunications services carrier; and on a periodic basis, synchronizing batch files passed from a subscriber data system of the first telecommunications services carrier to the customer affiliate subscriber information database to ensure the customer affiliate subscriber information database has complete information related to a subscriber to the first telecommunications services carrier and the second telecommunications services carrier.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Hanagan and Cingular fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature specified in amended claim 11. For example, the combination of Hanagan and Cingular fails to disclose, on a periodic basis, updating a customer affiliate subscriber information database in a businesses services platform the services changes that affect the second telecommunications services carrier; and on a periodic basis, synchronizing batch

files passed from a subscriber data system of the first telecommunications services carrier to the customer affiliate subscriber information database to ensure the customer affiliate subscriber information database has complete information related to a subscriber to the first telecommunications services carrier and the second telecommunications services carrier.

In contrast and as stated in the Final Office Action, Hanagan fails to disclose requiring on a periodic basis, updating a customer affiliate subscriber information database in a business services platform the service changes that affect the second telecommunications services carrier; and on a periodic basis, synchronizing batch files passed from a subscriber data system of the first telecommunications services carrier to the customer affiliated subscriber information database to ensure the customer affiliated subscriber information database has completed information related to a subscriber to the first telecommunications services carrier and the second telecommunication services carrier.” See Final Office Action, pages 5-6. Consequently, Hanagan fails to disclose the aforementioned recitation.

Cingular fails to overcome Hanagan’s deficiencies. In contrast, Cingular merely discusses that Cingular Wireless became the first major cellular phone company to let customers roll over unused minutes to a following month. See paragraph 6. As state above, Cingular appears to be a news article that provides no technical description of Cingular Wireless’s product. Therefore, Cingular fails to disclose periodic updates of subscriber information.

Thus, based on the foregoing, amended claim 11 is allowable over the combination of Hanagan and Cingular and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 12-14 and 16 depend from amended claim 11, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

Date: October 7, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

39262

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE